

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1-4, 6-8, 32, 35, 41, 44-48 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 32, 35 and 41, which are independent, are hereby amended. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the Specification as originally filed and specifically at Page 7 (paragraphs [0054]-[0057] of Applicants' corresponding published application) and Fig. 4(a) to 4(c). It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes to claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

II. OBJECTION TO SPECIFICATION

In response to the objection to the Specification, Applicants submit that the specification, as originally filed, includes a statement identifying the computer readable media in paragraph [0065] of Applicants' corresponding published application, and Fig. 5, which describes "as shown in FIG. 5, the communication I/F 11, the CPU 12, the EEPROM 13, the RAM 14, the HD 15, the drive 16, the input I/F 18 and the output I/F 23 are mutually connected

by way of the bus". Thus, Applicants respectfully request the objection to the Specification be withdrawn.

III. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-4, 6-8, 32, 35, 41 and 44-48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,917,472 to Perala (hereinafter, merely "Perala") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,175,842 to Kirk, et al. (hereinafter, merely "Kirk") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,900,869 to Higashio (hereinafter, merely "Higashio") further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,675,390 to Schindler et al. (hereinafter, merely "Schindler")..

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

"wherein said selection of content information is determined by a majority decision weighted with said priority value of said cursors and the other information selected by another cursor among said plurality of cursors is displayed within an alternative window"
(Emphasis added)

As understood by Applicants, Schindler relates to a system having a high quality monitor to display digitally received broadband video without loss of signal quality.

Applicants submit that neither Perala nor Kirk nor Higashio nor Schindler, taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest the above identified features of claim 1. Specifically, none of the references used as a basis for rejection describes that said selection of content information is determined by a majority decision weighted with said priority value of said cursors and the other information selected by another cursor among said plurality of cursors is displayed within an alternative window, as recited in claim 1.

Specifically, the Office Action concedes that Perala-Kirk-Higashio fail to teach displaying information selected by another cursor within an alternative window, but asserts that

Schindler teaches “displaying data in a picture in picture window and a primary window”. However, Applicants submit that in the Schindler system, both of the picture in the picture window and the picture in the primary window are **selected by a single user** (See, Schindler, col. 18, lines 10-29). In the present invention, as shown in Figs. 4(a)-4(c), the link part b is selected by cursor Cur-1 and cursor Cur-2, and the link part d is selected by cursor Cur-3, so based on a majority decision, web page B, which is corresponding to the link part b, is displayed, and the web page corresponding to the link part d which is selected by cursor Cur-3, is displayed within an alternative window (See, Specification, page 7, paragraphs [0054]-[0057] of Applicants’ corresponding published application, and Figs. 4(a)-4(c)). Thus, **in present invention, the displayed portion of the content information is selected by majority, and another portion displayed within an alternative window is selected by another user.**

Nothing has been found in Schindler that would teach said selection of content information is determined by a majority decision weighted with said priority value of said cursors and the other information selected by another cursor among said plurality of cursors is displayed within an alternative window, as recited in claim 1.

Furthermore, this deficiency of Schindler is not cured by the supplemental teaching of Perala or Kirk or Higashio.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable.

For reasons similar to those described above with regard to independent claim 1, independent claims 32, 35 and 41 are also patentable.

IV. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

Similarly, because Applicants maintain that all claims are allowable for at least the reasons presented hereinabove, in the interests of brevity, this response does not comment on each and every comment made by the Examiner in the Office Action. This should not be taken as acquiescence of the substance of those comments, and Applicants reserve the right to address such comments.

CONCLUSION

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosures in the cited reference, or references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference, or references, providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By 
Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
(212) 588-0800